

**REMARKS**

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the reasons that follow. Claims 1-18 were pending at the time of the outstanding Office Action. Of these claims, claims 1, 6 and 11 have been amended, and claims 4, 9 and 14 have been cancelled. Further, claims 19-27 have been added. Support for these amendments can be found at least on page 6, line 18 to page 7, line 1, page 7, lines 22-24, page 8, lines 3-6 and 9-14. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier. Thus, claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-13 and 15-27 are now pending in the application.

**Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103:**

Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2002/0057843 to Matsubara (hereinafter “Matsubara”) in view of JPEG2000 Image Coding System: Compound Image File Format (hereinafter “JPEG2000”). This rejection is traversed for at least the following reasons.

The independent claims teach several different parameters that are utilized in expanding an image. Specifically, the independent claims recite a coding parameter, an expanding parameter, and an extracting parameter calculated based on the coding parameter and the expanding parameter, among others. The independent claims 1, 6 and 11 have been amended to include the limitations of dependent claims 4, 9 and 14 respectively, to further describe the characteristics of the coding and expanding parameter, and to further explain how the extracting parameter is calculated. Specifically, the independent claims assert that **“the extracting parameter calculating means is configured to further calculate as the extracting parameters a resolution level necessary for expanding an image based on the coding parameters and the expanding parameters.”** (Independent claim 1, emphasis added; claims 6 and 11 recite analogous features.) The Office Action fails to provide any teaching or assertion that either Matsubara or JPEG2000 disclose this feature of the invention as claimed.

The Office Action asserts that Matsubara teaches extracting parameters in paragraphs 0066 and 0101:

“In this system, wavelet transform coefficients 3 previously obtained through wavelet transform and stored in a buffer memory are used. Specifically, the wavelet transform coefficients 4 in a decomposition level (i+1) having a size immediately larger than or equal to the determined size 2 , or the wavelet transform coefficients 5 in a decomposition level (i) having a size immediately smaller than or equal to the determined size 2 are utilized. That is, the decomposition level ‘i’ (integer) determined by the following formula (1) is obtained:

$$(\text{original image size})/2^{i+1} \leq (\text{determined image size}) < (\text{original image size})/2^i \quad (1)$$

The Examiner asserts that the “level number related to the determined image size are calculated.” (page 5, line 5 of the outstanding Office Action.) Finally, the Office Action asserts that Matsubara teaches calculating the extracting parameter: “The level numbers related to the determined image size are calculated” (page 3, lines 13-15). However, there is no teaching or suggestion in Matsubara that the extracting parameter calculating means (by which the level number is calculated, according to the Office Action) is configured to further calculate a resolution level necessary for expanding an image BASED UPON the coding parameters and the expanding parameters. As mentioned in a previous Amendment, Matsubara does not teach the usage or calculation of resolution.

JPEG2000 fails to make up for this deficiency of Matsubara. JPEG2000 teaches that a JPM file includes a resolution box and, potentially, a capture resolution box (B.6.2 and B.6.2.1) The resolution box can specify the capture and default resolutions of an object or image. The capture resolution is the resolution at which the image was obtained, and the default resolution is the resolution at which the image will be displayed with the JPM file. If necessary, the resolution is converted from the capture resolution to the default resolution. However, there is no teaching or suggestion in JPEG2000 that the resolution is calculated based upon the coding parameters and the expanding parameters. Rather, the resolution is

calculated solely based upon the captured and default resolutions. Thus, JPEG2000 also fails to teach this feature of the invention as claimed.

Thus, Matsubara, even in combination with JPEG2000, fails to meet the limitations of the independent claims, specifically failing to disclose the feature of “the extracting parameter calculating means is configured to further calculate as the extracting parameters a resolution level necessary for expanding an image based on the coding parameters and the expanding parameters.” Therefore, the independent claims are neither disclosed nor suggested by the Matsubara reference, the JPEG2000 reference, or the combination of the two, and, hence, are believed to be allowable.

The dependent claims are deemed allowable for at least the same reasons indicated above with regard to the independent claims from which they depend. In addition, they recite additional patentable features when considered as a whole.

For example, dependent claim 19 recites the feature that “the extracting parameter is calculated for each display based on a coding parameter and an expanding parameter, wherein the coding parameter is static for each display and the expanding parameter is dynamic for each display.” (Dependent claims 22 and 25 recite similar features.) Thus, the extracting parameters are calculated based upon the coding parameters, which are detected from a JMP file, and the expanding parameters, which are designated. There is no teaching or suggestion in Matsubara or JPEG2000 that “the extracting parameter is calculated for each display based on a coding parameter and an expanding parameter, wherein the coding parameter is static for each display and the expanding parameter is dynamic for each display.” Rather, the Examiner interprets the expanding parameters to be the determined image size. There is no teaching or suggestion in Matsubara or JPEG2000 that the expanding parameter is dynamic for each display, and the coding parameter is static for each display.

Further, dependent claim 20 recites the feature that “the coding parameter, the expanding parameter and the extracting parameter are numbers instead of image codes.” (Dependent claims 23 and 26 recite similar features.) This amendment finds support throughout the specification. For example, the coding parameters contain sizes (numbers), number of layout objects (numbers), tile information (height and width – numbers). The expanding parameters are also numbers: image size, number of layout objects and area (all

numbers). The extracting parameters are calculated based upon the coding parameters and expanding parameters and would hence be a number as well. Matsubara and JPEG2000 fail to teach this feature of the invention as claimed. The parameters taught by these two references are represented by image codes.

Dependent claim 21 recites the feature that “the extracting parameter is calculated based upon a resolution level which is included in the coding parameters.” (Dependent claims 24 and 27 recite similar features.) There is no teaching or suggestion in Matsubara or JPEG2000 that “the extracting parameter is calculated based upon a resolution level which is included in the coding parameters.”

**Conclusion:**

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 4/4/08

By George C. Beck

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP  
Customer Number: 22428  
Telephone: (202) 945-6014  
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

George C. Beck  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 38,072

Ramya Ananthanarayanan  
Agent for Applicant  
Registration No. 59,597